arXiv:1210.1075v1 [math.PR] 3 Oct 2012

A stochastic differential equation with a sticky point

Richard F. Bass*

October 4, 2012

Abstract

Abstract: We consider a degenerate stochastic differential equation that has a sticky point in the Markov process sense. We prove that weak existence and weak uniqueness hold, but that pathwise uniqueness does not hold nor does a strong solution exist.

Subject Classification: Primary 60H10; Secondary 60J60, 60J65

1 Introduction

The one-dimensional stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = \sigma(X_t)\, dW_t \tag{1.1}$$

has been the subject of intensive study for well over half a century. What can one say about pathwise uniqueness when σ is allowed to be zero at certain points? Of course, a large amount is known, but there are many unanswered questions remaining.

Consider the case where $\sigma(x) = |x|^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. When $\alpha \geq 1/2$, it is known there is pathwise uniqueness by the Yamada-Watanabe criterion (see, e.g., [4, Theorem 24.4]) while if $\alpha < 1/2$, it is known there are at least two

---

*Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0901505.

solutions, the zero solution and one that can be constructed by a non-trivial time change of Brownian motion. However, that is not the end of the story. In [5], it was shown that there is in fact pathwise uniqueness when $\alpha < 1/2$ provided one restricts attention to the class of solutions that spend zero time at 0.

This can be better understood by using ideas from Markov process theory. The continuous strong Markov processes on the real line that are on natural scale can be characterized by their speed measure. For the example in the preceding paragraph, the speed measure m is given by

$$m(dy) = 1_{(y\neq 0)}|y|^{-2\alpha}\, dy + \gamma\delta_0(dy),$$

where $\gamma \in [0,\infty]$ and δ_0 is point mass at 0. When $\gamma = \infty$, we get the 0 solution, or more precisely, the solution that stays at 0 once it hits 0. If we set $\gamma = 0$, we get the situation considered in [5] where the amount of time spent at 0 has Lebesgue measure zero, and pathwise uniqueness holds among such processes.

In this paper we study an even simpler equation:

$$dX_t = 1_{(X_t\neq 0)}\, dW_t, \qquad X_0 = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

where W is a one-dimensional Brownian motion. One solution is $X_t = W_t$, since Brownian motion spends zero time at 0. Another is the identically 0 solution.

We take $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$ and consider the class of solutions to (1.2) which spend a positive amount of time at 0, with the amount of time parameterized by γ.

We start by proving weak existence of solutions to (1.2) for each $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$. We in fact consider a much more general situation. We let m be any measure that gives finite positive mass to each open interval and define the notion of continuous martingales with speed measure m.

We prove weak uniqueness, or equivalently, uniqueness in law, among continuous martingales with speed measure m. The fact that we have uniqueness in law not only within the class of strong Markov processes but also within the class of continuous martingales with a given speed measure may be of independent interest.

We then restrict our attention to (1.2) and look at the class of continuous martingales that solve (1.2) and at the same time have speed measure m, where now

$$m(dy) = 1_{(y\neq 0)}\, dy + \gamma\delta_0(dy) \tag{1.3}$$

with $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$.

Even when we fix γ and restrict attention to solutions to (1.2) that have speed measure m given by (1.3), pathwise uniqueness does not hold. The proof of this fact is the main result of this paper. The reader familiar with excursions will recognize some ideas from that theory in the proof.

Finally, we prove that for each $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$, no strong solution to (1.2) among the class of continuous martingales with speed measure m given by (1.3) exists. Thus, given W, one cannot find a continuous martingale X with speed measure m satisfying (1.2) such that X is measurable with respect to the filtration of W. A consequence of this is that although one can find reasonable approximations to the solution of (1.2) which converge weakly, these approximations cannot converge in probability.

Besides increasing the versatility of (1.1), one can easily imagine a practical application of sticky points. Suppose a corporation has a takeover offer at \$10. The stock price is then likely to spend a great deal of time precisely at \$10 but is not constrained to stay at \$10. Thus \$10 would be a sticky point for the solution of the stochastic differential equation that describes the stock price.

After a short section of preliminaries, Section 2, we define speed measures for martingales in Section 3 and consider the existence of such martingales. Section 4 proves weak uniqueness, while in Section 5 we prove that continuous martingales with speed measure m given by (1.3) satisfy (1.2). Sections 6, 7, and 8 prove that pathwise uniqueness and strong existence fail. The first of these sections considers some approximations to a solution to (1.2), the second proves some needed estimates, and the proof is completed in the third.

Acknowledgment. We would like to thank Prof. H. Farnsworth for suggesting a mathematical finance interpretation of a sticky point.

2 Preliminaries

For information on martingales and stochastic calculus, see [4], [7] or [11]. For background on continuous Markov processes on the line, see the above references and also [3], [6], or [8].

We start with an easy lemma concerning continuous martingales.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose X is a continuous martingale which exits a finite non-empty interval I a.s. If the endpoints of the interval are a and b, $a < x < b$, and $X_0 = x$ a.s., then*

$$\mathbb{E}\, \langle X \rangle_{\tau_I} = (x-a)(b-x),$$

where τ_I is the first exit time of I and $\langle X \rangle_t$ is the quadratic variation process of X.

Proof. Any such martingale is a time change of a Brownian motion, at least up until the time of exiting the interval I. The result follows by performing a change of variables in the corresponding result for Brownian motion. □

Let I be a finite non-empty interval with endpoints $a < b$. Each of the endpoints may be in I or in I^c. Define $g_I(x,y)$ by

$$g_I(x,y) = \begin{cases} 2(x-a)(b-y)/(b-a), & x < y; \\ 2(y-a)(b-x)/(b-a), & x \geq y. \end{cases}$$

Let m be a measure such that m gives finite strictly positive measure to every finite open interval. Let

$$G_I(x) = \int_I g_I(x,y)\, m(dy).$$

If X is a real-valued process adapted to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ satisfying the usual conditions, we let

$$\tau_I = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \notin I\}. \tag{2.1}$$

When we want to have exit times for more than one process at once, we write $\tau_I(X)$, $\tau_I(Y)$, etc. Define

$$T_x = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t = x\}. \tag{2.2}$$

A continuous strong Markov process $(X, \mathbb{P}^x)$ on the real line is regular if $\mathbb{P}^x(T_y < \infty) > 0$ for each x and y. Thus, starting at x, there is positive probability of hitting y for each x and y. A regular continuous strong Markov process X is on natural scale if whenever I is a finite non-empty interval with endpoints $a < b$, then

$$\mathbb{P}^x(X_{\tau_I} = a) = \frac{b-x}{b-a}, \qquad \mathbb{P}^x(X_{\tau_I} = b) = \frac{x-a}{b-a}$$

provided $a < x < b$. A continuous regular strong Markov process on the line on natural scale has speed measure m if for each finite non-empty interval I we have

$$\mathbb{E}^x \tau_I = G_I(x)$$

whenever x is in the interior of I.

It is well known that if $(X, \mathbb{P}^x)$ and $(Y, \mathbb{Q}^x)$ are continuous regular strong Markov processes on the line on natural scale with the same speed measure m, then the law of X under $\mathbb{P}^x$ is equal to the law of Y under $\mathbb{Q}^x$ for each x. In addition, X will be a martingale under $\mathbb{P}^x$ for each x.

Let W_t be a one-dimensional Brownian motion and let $\{L_t^x\}$ be the jointly continuous local times. If we define

$$\alpha_t = \int L_t^y \, m(dy),$$

then α_t will be continuous and strictly increasing. If we let β_t be the inverse of α_t and set

$$X_t^M = W_{\beta_t}, \tag{2.3}$$

then X^M will be a continuous regular strong Markov process on natural scale with speed measure m. See the references listed above for a proof. We denote the law of X^M started at x_0 by $\mathbb{P}_M^{x_0}$.

If $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a probability space and $\mathcal{G}$ a σ-field contained in $\mathcal{F}$, a regular conditional probability $\mathbb{Q}$ for $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid \mathcal{G})$ is a map from $\Omega \times \mathcal{F}$ to $[0,1]$ such that
(1) for each $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbb{Q}(\cdot, A)$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}$;
(2) for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $\mathbb{Q}(\omega, \cdot)$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{F}$;
(3) for each $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbb{P}(A \mid \mathcal{G})(\omega) = \mathbb{Q}(\omega, A)$ for almost every ω.

Regular conditional probabilities do not always exist, but will if Ω has sufficient structure; see [4, Appendix C].

We use the letter c with or without subscripts to denote finite positive constants whose value may change from place to place.

3 Speed measure for martingales

Let $a : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be Borel measurable functions with $a(x) \le b(x)$ for all x. If S is a finite stopping time, let

$$\tau^S_{[a,b]} = \inf\{t > S : X_t \notin [a(X_S), b(X_S)]\}.$$

We say a continuous martingale X has speed measure m if

$$\mathbb{E}\,[\tau^S_{[a,b]} - S \mid \mathcal{F}_S] = G_{[a(X_S),b(X_S)]}(X_S), \qquad \text{a.s.} \tag{3.1}$$

whenever S is a finite stopping time and a and b are as above.

Theorem 3.1. *Let m be a measure that is finite and positive on every finite open interval. There exists a continuous martingale X with m as its speed measure.*

Proof. Set X equal to X^M as defined in (2.3). We only need show that (3.1) holds. Since X is a Markov process and has associated with it probabilities $\mathbb{P}^x$ and shift operators θ_t, then

$$\tau^S_{[a,b]} - S = \sigma_{[a(X_0),b(X_0)]} \circ \theta_S,$$

where $\sigma_{[a(X_0),b(X_0)]} = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \notin [a(X_0), b(X_0)]\}$. By the strong Markov property,

$$\mathbb{E}\,[\tau^S_{[a,b]} - S \mid \mathcal{F}_S] = \mathbb{E}^{\,X_S}\sigma_{[a(X_0),b(X_0)]} \qquad \text{a.s.} \tag{3.2}$$

For each y, $\sigma_{[a(X_0),b(X_0)]} = \tau_{[a(y),b(y)]}$ under $\mathbb{P}^y$, and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}^{\,y}\sigma_{[a(X_0),b(X_0)]} = G_{[a(y),b(y)]}(y).$$

Replacing y by $X_S(\omega)$ and substituting in (3.2) yields (3.1). $\square$

Theorem 3.2. *Let X be any continuous martingale that has speed measure m and let f be a non-negative Borel measurable function. Suppose $X_0 = x_0$, a.s. Let $I = [a,b]$ be a finite interval with $a < b$ such that m does not give positive mass to either end point. Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^{\tau_I} f(X_s)\, ds = \int_I g_I(x,y) f(y)\, m(dy). \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. It suffices to suppose that f is continuous and equal to 0 at the boundaries of I and then use a limit argument. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose δ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon$ if $|x-y| < \delta$ with $x, y \in I$.

Set $S_0 = 0$ and

$$S_{i+1} = \inf\{t > S_i : |X_t - X_{S_i}| \geq \delta\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^{\tau_I} f(X_s)\, ds = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \int_{S_i \wedge \tau_I}^{S_{i+1} \wedge \tau_I} f(X_s)\, ds$$

differs by at most $\varepsilon \mathbb{E}\, \tau_I$ from

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f(X_{S_i \wedge \tau_I})(S_{i+1} \wedge \tau_I - S_i \wedge \tau_I) \\ &\qquad = \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f(X_{S_i \wedge \tau_I}) \mathbb{E}\left[S_{i+1} \wedge \tau_I - S_i \wedge \tau_I \mid \mathcal{F}_{S_i \wedge \tau_I}\right] \Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Let $a(x) = a \vee (x - \delta)$ and $b(x) = b \wedge (x + \delta)$. Since X is a continuous martingale with speed measure m, the last line in (3.4) is equal to

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f(X_{S_i \wedge \tau_I}) G_{[a(X_{S_i \wedge \tau_I}), b(X_{S_i \wedge \tau_I})]}(X_{S_i \wedge \tau_I}). \tag{3.5}$$

Because $\mathbb{E}\, \tau_{[-N,N]} < \infty$ for all N, then X is a time change of a Brownian motion. It follows that the distribution of $\{X_{S_i \wedge \tau_I(X)}, i \geq 0\}$ is that of a simple random walk on the lattice $\{x + k\delta\}$ stopped the first time it exits I, and thus is the same as the distribution of $\{X^M_{S_i \wedge \tau_I(X^M)}, i \geq 0\}$. Therefore the expression is (3.5) is equal to the corresponding expression with X replaced by X^M. This in turns differs by at most $\mathbb{E}\,\varepsilon\tau_I(X^M)$ from

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^{\tau_I(X^M)} f(X_s^M)\,ds.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^{\tau_I(X)} f(X_s)\,ds = \mathbb{E}\int_0^{\tau_I(X^M)} f(X_s^M)\,ds. \tag{3.6}$$

The right hand side of (3.6) is equal to the right hand side of (3.3) by [3, Corollary IV.2.4]. □

4 Uniqueness in law

In this section we show that if X is a continuous martingale under $\mathbb{P}$ with speed measure m, then X has the same law as X^M.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose $\mathbb{P}$ is a probability measure and X is a continuous martingale with respect to $\mathbb{P}$. Suppose that X has speed measure m and $X_0 = x_0$ a.s. Then the law of X under $\mathbb{P}$ is equal to the law of X^M under $\mathbb{P}_M^{x_0}$.*

Proof. Let $R > 0$ be such that $m(\{-R\}) = m(\{R\}) = 0$ and set $I = [-R, R]$. Let $\overline{X}_t = X_{t\wedge\tau_I(X)}$ and $\overline{X}_t^M = X^M_{t\wedge\tau_I(X^M)}$, the processes X and X^M stopped on exiting I. Let

$$H_\lambda f = \mathbb{E}\int_0^{\tau_I(\overline{X})} e^{-\lambda t} f(\overline{X}_t)\,dt$$

and

$$H_\lambda^M f(x) = \mathbb{E}^x\int_0^{\tau_I(\overline{X}^M)} e^{-\lambda t} f(\overline{X}_t^M)\,dt$$

for $\lambda \geq 0$. Since $\overline{X}$ and $\overline{X}^M$ are stopped at times $\tau_I(\overline{X})$ and $\tau_I(\overline{X}^M)$, resp., we can replace $\tau_I(\overline{X})$ and $\tau_I(\overline{X}^M)$ by ∞ in both of the above integrals without affecting H_λ or H_λ^M as long as f is 0 on the boundary of I.

Suppose $f(-R) = f(R) = 0$. Then $H^M_\lambda f(-R)$ and $H^M_\lambda f(R)$ are also 0, since we are working with the stopped process.

We want to show

$$H_\lambda f = H^M_\lambda f(x_0), \qquad \lambda \geq 0. \tag{4.1}$$

By Theorem 3.2 we know (4.1) holds for $\lambda = 0$. Let $K = \mathbb{E}\,\tau_I(X)$. We have $\mathbb{E}^{\,x_0}\tau_I(X^M) = K$ as well since both X and X^M have speed measure m.

Let $\lambda = 0$ and $\mu \leq 1/2K$. Let $t > 0$ and let $Y_s = \overline{X}_{s+t}$. Let $\mathbb{Q}_t$ be a regular conditional probability for $\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{F}_t)$. It is easy to see that for almost every ω, Y is a continuous martingale under $\mathbb{Q}_t(\omega, \cdot)$ started at $\overline{X}_t$ and Y has speed measure m. Cf. Section I.5 of [3] or [5]. Therefore by Theorem 3.2

$$\mathbb{E}_{\,\mathbb{Q}_t} \int_0^\infty f(Y_s)\, ds = H^M_0 f(\overline{X}_t).$$

This can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty f(\overline{X}_{s+t})\, ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t\Big] = H^M_0 f(\overline{X}_t), \qquad \text{a.s.} \tag{4.2}$$

as long as f is 0 on the endpoints of I.

Therefore, recalling that $\lambda = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_\mu H^M_\lambda f &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} H^M_\lambda f(\overline{X}_t)\, dt \qquad\qquad (4.3)\\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} \mathbb{E}\Big[\int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(\overline{X}_{s+t})\, ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t\Big]\, dt\\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} e^{\lambda t} \int_t^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(\overline{X}_s)\, ds\, dt\\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \int_0^s e^{-(\mu-\lambda)t}\, dt\, e^{-\lambda s} f(\overline{X}_s)\, ds\\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-(\mu-\lambda)s}}{\mu - \lambda} e^{-\lambda s} f(\overline{X}_s)\, ds\\ &= \frac{1}{\mu-\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda s} f(\overline{X}_s)\, ds - \frac{1}{\mu-\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu s} f(\overline{X}_s)\, ds.\\ &= \frac{1}{\mu-\lambda} H^M_\lambda f(x_0) - \frac{1}{\mu-\lambda} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu s} f(\overline{X}_s)\, ds. \end{aligned}$$

We used (4.2) in the second equality. Rearranging,

$$H_\mu f = H_\lambda^M f(x_0) + (\lambda - \mu) H_\mu(H_\lambda^M f). \tag{4.4}$$

Since $\overline{X}$ and $\overline{X}^M$ are stopped upon exiting I, then $H_\lambda^M f = 0$ at the endpoints of I. We now replace f by $H_\lambda^M f$ in (4.4) and obtain

$$H_\mu f = H_\lambda^M f(x_0) + (\lambda - \mu) H_\lambda^M (H_\lambda^M f)(x_0) + (\lambda - \mu)^2 H_\mu(H_\lambda^M (H_\lambda^M f)).$$

We continue. Since

$$|H_\mu g| \le \|g\| \mathbb{E}\, \tau_I(X) = \|g\| K$$

and

$$\|H_\lambda^M g\| \le \|g\| \mathbb{E}\, \tau_I(X^M) = \|g\| K$$

for each bounded g, where $\|g\|$ is the supremum norm of g, we can iterate and get convergence as long as $\mu \le 1/2K$ and obtain

$$H_\mu f = H_\lambda^M f(x_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ((\lambda - \mu) H_\lambda^M)^i H_\lambda^M f(x_0).$$

The above also holds when $\overline{X}$ is replaced by $\overline{X}^M$, so that

$$H_\mu^M f(x_0) = H_\lambda^M f(x_0) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ((\lambda - \mu) H_\lambda^M)^i H_\lambda^M f(x_0).$$

We conclude $H_\mu f = H_\mu^M f(x_0)$ as long as $\mu \le 1/2K$ and f is 0 on the endpoints of I.

This holds for every starting point. If $Y_s = \overline{X}_{s+t}$ and $\mathbb{Q}_t$ is a regular conditional probability for the law of Y_s under $\mathbb{P}^x$ given $\mathcal{F}_t$, then we asserted above that Y is a continuous martingale started at $\overline{X}_t$ with speed measure m under $\mathbb{Q}_t(\omega, \cdot)$ for almost every ω. We replace x_0 by $\overline{X}_t(\omega)$ in the preceding paragraph and derive

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\mu s} f(\overline{X}_{s+t})\, ds \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right] = H_\lambda^M f(\overline{X}_t), \qquad \text{a.s.}$$

if $\lambda \le 1/2K$ and f is 0 on the endpoints of I.

We now take $\lambda = 1/2K$ and $\mu \in (1/2K, 2/2K]$. The same argument as above shows that $H_\mu f = H_\mu^M f(x_0)$ as long as f is 0 on the endpoints of I. This is true for every starting point. We continue, letting $\lambda = n/2K$ and using induction, and obtain

$$H_\mu f = H_\mu^M f(x_0)$$

for every $\mu \geq 0$.

Now suppose f is continuous with compact support and R is large enough so that $(-R, R)$ contains the support of f. We have that

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^{\tau_{[-R,R]}(\overline{X})} e^{-\mu t} f(\overline{X}_t)\, dt = \mathbb{E}^{x_0} \int_0^{\tau_{[-R,R]}(\overline{X}^M)} e^{-\mu t} f(\overline{X}_t^M)\, dt$$

for all $\mu > 0$. This can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} f(X_{t \wedge \tau_{[-R,R]}(X)})\, dt = \mathbb{E}^{x_0} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} f(X^M_{t \wedge \tau_{[R,R]}(X^M)})\, dt. \tag{4.5}$$

If we hold μ fixed and let $R \to \infty$ in (4.5), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} f(X_t)\, dt = \mathbb{E}^{x_0} \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t} f(X_t^M)\, dt$$

for all $\mu > 0$. By the uniqueness of the Laplace transform and the continuity of f, X, and X^M,

$$\mathbb{E}\, f(X_t) = \mathbb{E}^{x_0} f(X_t^M)$$

for all t. By taking limits, this holds whenever $f$is a bounded Borel measurable function.

This holds for all starting points x_0 and using regular conditional probabilities as above,

$$\mathbb{E}\,[f(X_{t+s}) \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}^{x_0}[f(X_{t+s}^M) \mid \mathcal{F}_t].$$

By the Markov property, the right hand side is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}^{X_t^M} f(X_s) = P_s f(X_t^M),$$

where P_s is the transition probability kernel for X^M.

To prove that the finite dimensional distributions of X and X^M agree, we use induction. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\prod_{j=1}^{n+1} f_j(X_{t_j}) &= \mathbb{E}_i \prod_{j=1}^{n} f_j(X_{t_j})\mathbb{E}_i[f_{n+1}(X_{t_{n+1}}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_n}]\\ &= \mathbb{E}_i \prod_{j=1}^{n} f_j(X_{t_j}) P_{t_{n+1}-t_n} f_{n+1}(X_{t_n}).\end{aligned}$$

We use the induction hypothesis to see that this is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}^{x_0}\prod_{j=1}^{n} f_j(X^M_{t_j}) P_{t_{n+1}-t_n} f_{n+1}(X^M_{t_n}).$$

We then use the Markov property to see that this in turn is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}^{x_0}\prod_{j=1}^{n+1} f_j(X^M_{t_j}).$$

Since X and X^M have continuous paths and the same finite dimensional distributions, they have the same law. □

5 The stochastic differential equation

We now discuss the particular stochastic differential equation we want our martingales to solve. We specialize to the following speed measure. Let $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$ and let

$$m(dx) = dx + \gamma\delta_0(dx), \tag{5.1}$$

where δ_0 is point mass at 0.

We consider the stochastic differential equation

$$X_t = x_0 + \int_0^t 1_{(X_s \neq 0)}\, dW_s. \tag{5.2}$$

A weak solution to (5.2) is a triple $(X, W, \mathbb{P})$ where $\mathbb{P}$ is a probability measure, W is a Brownian motion under $\mathbb{P}$, and X is a continuous martingale satisfying (5.2).

We now show that any martingale that has speed measure m is the first element of a triple that is a weak solution to (5.2).

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a probability measure and let X be a continuous martingale which has speed measure m. There exists a Brownian motion W such that $(X, W, \mathbb{P})$ is a weak solution to* (5.2)*. Moreover*

$$X_t = x_0 + \int_0^t 1_{(X_s \neq 0)}\, dX_s. \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. Let

$$W'_t = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s \neq 0)}\, dX_s.$$

Hence

$$d\langle W' \rangle_t = 1_{(X_t \neq 0)}\, d\langle X \rangle_t.$$

Let $0 < \eta < \delta$. Let $S_0 = \inf\{t : |X_t| \geq \delta\}$, $T_i = \inf\{t > S_i : |X_t| \leq \eta\}$, and $S_{i+1} = \inf\{t > T_i : |X_t| \geq \delta\}$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots$. The speed measure of X is Lebesgue measure away from 0, so X is a Brownian motion as long as it is away from 0. Thus for each N,

$$\int_0^t 1_{\cup_{i=0}^N [S_i, T_i]}(s)\, d\langle X \rangle_s = \int_0^t 1_{\cup_{i=0}^N [S_i, T_i]}(s)\, ds.$$

Letting $N \to \infty$, then $\eta \to 0$, and finally $\delta \to 0$, we obtain

$$\int_0^t 1_{(X_s \neq 0)}\, d\langle X \rangle_s = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s \neq 0)}\, ds.$$

Let V_t be an independent Brownian motion and let

$$W''_t = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s = 0)}\, dV_s.$$

Let $W_t = W'_t + W''_t$. Clearly W' and W'' are orthogonal martingales, so

$$d\langle W \rangle_t = d\langle W' \rangle_t + d\langle W'' \rangle_t = 1_{(X_t \neq 0)}\, dt + 1_{(X_t = 0)}\, dt = dt.$$

By Lévy's theorem (see [4, Theorem 12.1]), W is a Brownian motion.

Recall that we set

$$W'_t = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s \neq 0)}\, dX_s.$$

Define

$$M_t = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s = 0)}\, dX_s.$$

Let I be the interval $[-R, R]$. The martingales W' and M are orthogonal, so we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\,\langle X\rangle_{\tau_I} &= \mathbb{E}\int_0^{\tau_I} 1_{(X_s\neq 0)}\, ds + \mathbb{E}\,\langle M\rangle_{\tau_I}\\
&= \int_I g_I(x_0,y) 1_{(y\neq 0)}\, m(dy) + \mathbb{E}\,\langle M\rangle_{\tau_I}\\
&= \int_I g_I(x_0,y)\, dy + \mathbb{E}\,\langle M\rangle_{\tau_I}\\
&= (x_0+R)(R-x_0) + \mathbb{E}\,\langle M\rangle_{\tau_I}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows by Theorem 3.2, while the last follows from a direct calculation.

Since X is a continuous martingale equal in law to X^M, then $\tau_I < \infty$ a.s., and so by Lemma 2.1,

$$\mathbb{E}\,\langle X\rangle_{\tau_I} = (x_0+R)(R-x_0).$$

We conclude that $\mathbb{E}\,\langle M\rangle_{\tau_I} = 0$, which implies that $M_t = 0$ for $t \leq \tau_I$. Since R is arbitrary, then M_t is identically zero, and hence $X_t = W'_t$.

Using the definition of W, we deduce

$$1_{(X_t\neq 0)}\, dW_t = 1_{(X_t\neq 0)}\, dX_t = dW'_t = dX_t, \tag{5.4}$$

as required. $\square$

We now show weak uniqueness, that is, if $(X, W, \mathbb{P})$ and $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{W}, \widetilde{\mathbb{P}})$ are two weak solutions to (5.2) and in addition X and $\widetilde{X}$ have speed measure m, then the joint law of (X, W) under $\mathbb{P}$ equals the joint law of $(\widetilde{X}', \widetilde{W}')$ under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}'$. This holds even though W will not in general be adapted to the filtration of X. We know that the law of X under $\mathbb{P}$ equals the law of $\widetilde{X}$ under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ and also that the law of W under $\mathbb{P}$ equals the law of $\widetilde{W}$ under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$, but the issue here is the joint law.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose* $(X, W, \mathbb{P})$ *and* $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{W}, \widetilde{\mathbb{P}})$ *are two weak solutions to* (5.2) *and that* X *and* $\widetilde{X}$ *are both continuous martingales with speed measure* m. *Then the joint law of* (X, W) *under* $\mathbb{P}$ *equals the joint law of* $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{W})$ *under* $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$.

Proof. Since X and $\widetilde{X}$ have speed measure m, the law of X under $\mathbb{P}$ is equal to the law of $\widetilde{X}$ under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ by Theorem 4.1.

Let $W'_t = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s \neq 0)}\, dW_s = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s \neq 0)}\, dX_s$ and $W''_t = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s = 0)}\, dW_s$ and define $\widetilde{W'_t}$ and $\widetilde{W''_t}$ similarly. The joint law of (X, W') under $\mathbb{P}$ equals the joint law of $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{W})$ under $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}$ because W' is adapted to the filtration of X and similarly for $\widetilde{W'}$.

Therefore it suffices to show that conditional on the law of X under $\mathbb{P}$ we have that the law of W'' is uniquely determined. Let $\alpha_t = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s=0)}\, ds$ and let β_t be the right continuous inverse of α_t. Then W''_{β_t} will be a continuous martingale with quadratic variation equal to t, and hence by Lévy's theorem a Brownian motion. Thus $\{W''_{\beta_t}, t \geq 0\}$ has a law that is uniquely determined given the law of X. Since α is adapted to the filtration of X, its law is uniquely determined given the law of X, and hence so is the law of β. We conclude that the law of $\{W''_t, t \geq 0\} = \{W''_{\beta(\alpha_t)}, t \geq 0\}$ is uniquely determined given the law of X. □

6 Approximating processes

Let W^ε be a Brownian motion and let X^ε_t be the solution to

$$dX^\varepsilon_t = \sigma_\varepsilon(X^\varepsilon_t)\, dW^\varepsilon_t, \qquad X^\varepsilon_0 = x_0, \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$\sigma_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & |x| > \varepsilon; \\ \sqrt{\varepsilon/\gamma}, & |x| \leq \varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

For each x_0 the solution to the stochastic differential equation is unique by [10] or [9]. We also know that if $\mathbb{P}^x_\varepsilon$ is the law of X^ε starting from x, then $(X^\varepsilon, \mathbb{P}^x_\varepsilon)$ is a continuous regular strong Markov process on natural scale. The speed measure of X^ε will be

$$m_\varepsilon(dy) = dy + \frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon} 1_{[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]}(y)\, dy.$$

Let

$$Y_t^\varepsilon = X_t^{2\varepsilon}. \tag{6.2}$$

Since $\sigma_\varepsilon \le 1$, then $d\langle X^\varepsilon \rangle_t \le dt$. By the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequalities (see, e.g., [4, Section 12.5]),

$$\mathbb{E}\, |X_t^\varepsilon - X_s^\varepsilon|^{2p} \le c|t-s|^p$$

for each $p \ge 1$, where the constant c depends on p. It follows (for example, by Theorems 8.1 and 32.1 of [4]) that the law of X^ε is tight in $C[0, t_0]$ for each t_0. The same is of course true for Y^ε and W^ε, and so the triple $(X^\varepsilon, Y^\varepsilon, W^\varepsilon)$ is tight.

Let P_t^ε be the transition probabilities for the Markov process X^ε. Let C_0 be the set of continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}$ that vanish at infinity and let

$$L = \{ f \in C_0 : |f(x) - f(y)| \le |x-y|, x, y \in \mathbb{R} \},$$

the set of Lipschitz functions with Lipschitz constant 1 that vanish at infinity.

One of the main results of [1] (see Theorem 4.2) is that P_t^ε maps L into L for each t and each $\varepsilon < 1$.

Theorem 6.1. *If $f \in C_0$, then $P_t^\varepsilon f$ converges uniformly for each $t \ge 0$. If we denote the limit by $P_t f$, then $\{P_t\}$ is a family of transition probabilities for a continuous regular strong Markov process $(X, \mathbb{P}^x)$ on natural scale with speed measure given by* (5.1)*. For each x, $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^x$ converges weakly to $\mathbb{P}^x$ with respect to $C[0, N]$ for each N.*

Proof. Step 1. Let $\{g_j\}$ be a countable collection of C^2 functions in L with compact support such that the set of finite linear combinations of elements of $\{g_j\}$ is dense in C_0 with respect to the supremum norm.

Let ε_n be a sequence converging to 0. Suppose g_j has support contained in $[-K, K]$ with $K > 1$. Since X_t^ε is a Brownian motion outside $[-1, 1]$, if $|x| > 2K$, then

$$|P_t^\varepsilon g_j(x)| = |\mathbb{E}^{\,x} g_j(X_t^\varepsilon)| \le \|g_j\|\, \mathbb{P}^x(|X^\varepsilon| \text{ hits } |x|/2 \text{ before time } t),$$

which tends to 0 uniformly over $\varepsilon < 1$ as $|x| \to \infty$. Here $\|g_j\|$ is the supremum norm of g_j. By the equicontinuity of the $P^\varepsilon_t g_j$, using the diagonalization method there exists a subsequence, which we continue to denote by ε_n, such that $P^{\varepsilon_n}_t g_j$ converges uniformly on $\mathbb{R}$ for every rational $t \ge 0$ and every j. We denote the limit by $P_t g_j$.

Since $g_j \in C^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} P^\varepsilon_t g_j(x) - P^\varepsilon_s g_j(x) &= \mathbb{E}^x g_j(X^\varepsilon_t) - \mathbb{E}^x g_j(X^\varepsilon_s) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^x \int_s^t \sigma_\varepsilon(X^\varepsilon_r) g'_j(X^\varepsilon_r)\, dW_r + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}^x \int_s^t \sigma_\varepsilon(X^\varepsilon_r)^2 g''_j(X^\varepsilon_r)\, dr \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}^x \int_s^t \sigma_\varepsilon(X^\varepsilon_r)^2 g''_j(X^\varepsilon_r)\, dr, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Ito's formula. Since σ_ε is bounded by 1, we obtain

$$|P^\varepsilon_t g_j(x) - P^\varepsilon_s g_j(x)| \le c_j |t-s|,$$

where the constant c_j depends on g_j. With this fact, we can deduce that $P^{\varepsilon_n}_t g_j$ converges uniformly in C_0 for every $t \ge 0$. We again call the limit $P_t g_j$. Since linear combinations of the g_j's are dense in C_0, we conclude that $P^{\varepsilon_n}_t g$ converges uniformly to a limit, which we call $P_t g$, whenever $g \in C_0$. We note that P_t maps C_0 into C_0.

Step 2. Each X^ε_t is a Markov process, so $P^\varepsilon_s(P^\varepsilon_t g) = P^\varepsilon_{s+t} g$. By the uniform convergence and equicontinuity and the fact that P^ε_s is a contraction, we see that $P_s(P_t g) = P_{s+t} g$ whenever $g \in C_0$.

Let $s_1 < s_2 < \cdots s_j$ and let $f_1, \ldots f_j$ be elements of L. Define inductively $g_j = f_j$, $g_{j-1} = f_{j-1}(P_{s_j - s_{j-1}} g_j)$, $g_{j-2} = f_{j-2}(P_{s_{j-1}-s_{j-2}} g_{j-1})$, and so on. Define g^ε_j analogously where we replace P_t by P^ε_t. By the Markov property applied repeatedly,

$$\mathbb{E}^x[f_1(X^\varepsilon_{s_1}) \cdots f_j(X^\varepsilon_{s_j})] = P^\varepsilon_{s_1} g^\varepsilon_1(x).$$

Suppose x is fixed for the moment and let $f_1, \cdots, f_j \in L$. Suppose there is a subsequence $\varepsilon_{n'}$ of ε_n such that $X^{\varepsilon_{n'}}$ converges weakly, say to X, and let $\mathbb{P}'$ be the limit law with corresponding expectation $\mathbb{E}'$. Using the uniform convergence, the equicontinuity, and the fact that P^ε_t maps L into L, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}'[f_1(X_{s_1}) \cdots f_j(X_{s_j})] = P_{s_1} g_1(x). \tag{6.3}$$

We can conclude several things from this. First, since the limit is the same no matter what subsequence $\{\varepsilon_{n'}\}$ we use, then the full sequence $\mathbb{P}^x_{\varepsilon_n}$ converges weakly. This holds for each starting point x.

Secondly, if we denote the weak limit of the $\mathbb{P}_{\varepsilon_n}$ by $\mathbb{P}^x$, then (6.3) holds with $\mathbb{E}'$ replaced by $\mathbb{E}^x$. From this we deduce that $(X, \mathbb{P}^x)$ is a Markov process with transition semigroup given by P_t.

Thirdly, since $\mathbb{P}^x$ is the weak limit of probabilities on $C[0,\infty)$, we conclude that X under $\mathbb{P}^x$ has continuous paths for each x.

Step 3. Since P_t maps C_0 into C_0 and $P_t f(x) = \mathbb{E}^x f(X_t) \to f(x)$ by the continuity of paths if $f \in C_0$, we conclude by [4, Theorem 20.9] that $(X, \mathbb{P}^x)$ is in fact a strong Markov process.

Suppose $f_1, \ldots, f_j$ are in L and $s_1 < s_2 < \cdots < s_j < t < u$. Since X^ε_t is a martingale,

$$\mathbb{E}^x_\varepsilon \Big[X^\varepsilon_u \prod_{i=1}^j f_i(X^\varepsilon_{s_i}) \Big] = \mathbb{E}^x \Big[X^\varepsilon_t \prod_{i=1}^j f_i(X^\varepsilon_{s_i}) \Big].$$

Passing to the limit along the sequence ε_n, we have the equality with X^ε replaced by X and $\mathbb{E}^x_\varepsilon$ replaced by $\mathbb{E}^x$. Since the collection of random variables of the form $\prod_i f_i(X_{s_i})$ generate $\sigma(X_r; r \le t)$, it follows that X is a martingale under $\mathbb{P}^x$ for each x.

Step 4. Let $\delta, \eta > 0$. Let $I = [q, r]$ and $I^* = [q - \delta, r + \delta]$.

If $A^\varepsilon_t = t \wedge \tau_{I^*}(X^\varepsilon)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\, [A^\varepsilon_\infty - A^\varepsilon_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}^{X^\varepsilon_t} A^\varepsilon_\infty \le \sup_x \mathbb{E}^x \tau_{I^*}(X^\varepsilon).$$

The last term is equal to

$$\sup_x \int_{I^*} g_{I^*}(x,y) \Big(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon} 1_{I^*}(y)\Big)\, dy.$$

A simple calculation shows that this is bounded by $cr^2 + c\gamma r$, where c does not depend on r, γ, or ε. By Theorem I.6.10 of [2], we then deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}\, \tau_{I^*}(X^\varepsilon)^2 = \mathbb{E}\, (A^\varepsilon_\infty)^2 < c < \infty,$$

where c does not depend on ε. By Chebyshev's inequality, for each t,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_{I^*}(X^\varepsilon) \ge t) \le c/t^2.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\tau_I(X) > t) &= \mathbb{P}(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s| \le r, \inf_{s\le t}|X_s \ge q)\\ &\le \limsup_{\varepsilon_n\to 0}\mathbb{P}(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon_n}| \le r, \inf_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon} \ge q)\\ &\le \limsup_{\varepsilon_n\to 0}\mathbb{P}(\tau_{I^*}(X^{\varepsilon_n}) > t) \le c/t^2.\end{aligned}$$

Choose u_0 such that

$$\int_{u_0}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}(\tau_I(X) > t)\,dt < \eta, \qquad \int_{u_0}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}(\tau_{I^*}(X^{\varepsilon_n}) > t)\,dt < \eta$$

for each ε_n.

Let f and g be continuous functions taking values in $[0,1]$ such that f is equal to 1 on $(-\infty, r]$ and 0 on $[r+\delta,\infty)$ and g is equal to 1 on $[q,\infty)$ and 0 on $(-\infty, q-\delta]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s| \le r, \inf_{s\le t}|X_s \ge q) &\le \mathbb{E}\,[f(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s|)g(\inf_{s\le t}|X_s|)]\\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon_n\to 0}\mathbb{E}\,[f(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon_n}|)g(\inf_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon_n}|)].\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{u_0}\mathbb{P}(\tau_I(X) > t)\,dt &= \int_0^{u_0}\mathbb{P}(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s| \le r, \inf_{s\le t}|X_s| \ge q)\,dt\\ &\le \int_0^{u_0}\mathbb{E}\,[f(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s|)g(\inf_{s\le t}|X_s|)]\,dt\\ &= \int_0^{u_0}\lim_{\varepsilon_n\to 0}\mathbb{E}\,[f(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon_n}|)g(\inf_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon_n}|)]\,dt\\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon_n\to 0}\int_0^{u_0}\mathbb{E}\,[f(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon_n}|)g(\inf_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon_n}|)]\,dt\\ &\le \limsup_{\varepsilon_n\to 0}\int_0^{u_0}\mathbb{P}(\sup_{s\le t}|X_s^{\varepsilon_n}| \le r+\delta, \inf_{s\le t}|X_s| \ge q-\delta)\,dt\\ &\le \limsup_{\varepsilon_n\to 0}\int_0^{u_0}\mathbb{P}(\tau_{I^*}(X^{\varepsilon_n}) \ge t)\,dt\\ &\le \limsup_{\varepsilon_n\to 0}\mathbb{E}\,\tau_{I^*}(X^{\varepsilon_n}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}\,\tau_I(X) \le \int_0^{u_0} \mathbb{P}(\tau_I(X) > t)\,dt + \eta \le \limsup_{\varepsilon_n \to 0} \mathbb{E}\,\tau_{I^*}(X^{\varepsilon_n}) + \eta.$$

We now use the fact that η is arbitrary and let $\eta \to 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\,\tau_I(X) &\le \limsup_{\varepsilon_n \to 0} \mathbb{E}\,\tau_{I^*}(X^{\varepsilon_n})\\ &= \limsup_{\varepsilon_n \to 0} \int_{I^*} g_{I^*}(0,y)\Big(1 + \frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon} 1_{[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]}(y)\Big)\,dy\\ &= \int_{I^*} g_{I^*}(0,y) m(dy).\end{aligned}$$

We next use the joint continuity of $g_{[-a,a]}(x,y)$ in the variables a, x and y. Letting $\delta \to 0$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\,\tau_I(X) \le \int_I g_I(0,y)\,m(dy).$$

The lower bound for $\mathbb{E}\,\tau_I(X)$ is done similarly, and we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\,\tau_I(X) = \int_I g_I(0,y)\,m(dy). \tag{6.4}$$

Step 5. Next we show that X is a regular strong Markov process. This means that if $x \ne y$, $\mathbb{P}^x(X_t = y \text{ for some } t) > 0$. To show this, assume without loss of generality that $y < x$. Suppose X starting from x does not hit y with positive probability. Let $z = x + 4|x - y|$. Since $\mathbb{E}^x \tau_{[y,z]} < \infty$, then with probability one X hits z and does so before hitting y. Hence $T_z = \tau_{[y,z]} < \infty$ a.s. Choose t large so that $\mathbb{P}^x(\tau_{[y,z]} > t) < 1/16$. By the optional stopping theorem,

$$\mathbb{E}^x X_{T_z \wedge t} \ge z\mathbb{P}^x(T_z \le t) + y\mathbb{P}^x(T_z > t) = z - (z-y)\mathbb{P}^x(T_z > t).$$

By our choice of z, this is greater than x, which contradicts that X is a martingale. Hence X must hit y with positive probability.

Therefore X is a regular continuous strong Markov process on the real line. Since it is a martingale, it is on natural scale. Since its speed measure is the same as that of X^M by (6.4), we conclude from [3] that X and X^M have the same law. In particular, X is a martingale with speed measure m.

Step 6. Since we obtain the same limit law no matter what sequence ε_n we started with, the full sequence P_t^ε converges to P_t and $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon^x$ converges weakly to $\mathbb{P}^x$ for each x.

All of the above applies equally well to Y and its transition probabilities and laws. □

Take a subsequence of $(X^\varepsilon, Y^\varepsilon, W^\varepsilon)$ that converges weakly, say to the triple (X, Y, W), with respect to $C[0,N] \times C[0,N] \times C[0,N]$ for each N. The last task of this section is to prove that X and Y satisfy (5.2).

Theorem 6.2. *(X, W) and (Y, W) each satisfy (5.2).*

Proof. We prove this for X as the proof for Y is exactly the same. Fix N. By Skorokhod's representation theorem, there exist random variables X_n', W_n', X', and W' defined on a common probability space such that (X_n', W_n') has the same joint law as $(X^{\varepsilon_n}, W^{\varepsilon_n})$ for each n, (X', W') has the same joint law as (X, W), and (X_n', W_n') converges a.s. to (X', W') with respect to the topology of $C[0,N] \times C[0,N]$.

We will show

$$\int_0^t 1_{(X_s' \neq 0)}\, dX_s' = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s' \neq 0)}\, dW_s' \tag{6.5}$$

if $t \le N$. We know the law of X' is equal to the law of X^M, and by (5.4)

$$X_t' = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s' \neq 0)}\, dX_s' = \int_0^t 1_{(X_s' \neq 0)}\, dW_s'.$$

Since (X', W') has the same joint law as (X, W), that will prove the equality we want.

Let $\delta > 0$ and let g be a continuous function taking values in $[0,1]$ such that $g(x) = 0$ if $|x| < \delta$ and $g(x) = 1$ if $|x| \ge 2\delta$. Since (X_n', W_n') has the same joint law as $(X^{\varepsilon_n}, W^{\varepsilon_n})$, then

$$\int_0^t g(X_n'(s))\, dX_n'(s) = \int_0^t g(X_n'(s))\, dW_n'(s)$$

if $t \le N$ and n is large enough. By the a.s. convergence and the fact that g is bounded by 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Big(\int_0^t g(X_n'(s))\,dW_n'(s) - \int_0^t g(X_n'(s))\,dW_s'\Big)^2 & \qquad (6.6)\\ = \mathbb{E}\int_0^t |g(X_n'(s))|^2\,d\langle W_n' - W'\rangle_s &\\ \le \mathbb{E}\,\langle W_n' - W'\rangle_t = \mathbb{E}\,(W_n'(t) - W_t')^2 \to 0. & \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Big(\int_0^t g(X_n'(s))\,dW_s' - \int_0^t g(X_s')\,dW_s'\Big)^2 & \qquad (6.7)\\ = \mathbb{E}\int_0^t |g(X_n'(s)) - g(X_s')|^2\,ds \to 0 & \end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

We note that $dX_n'(t) = \sigma_\varepsilon(X_n'(t))\,dW_n'(t)$, so $d\langle X_n'\rangle_t \le dt$. In particular $(X_n'(t))^2 - t$ is a supermartingale, and passing to the limit, $(X_t')^2 - t$ is also, so $d\langle X'\rangle_t \le dt$. If we replace W_n' by X_n' and W' by X' in (6.6) and (6.7), we see that

$$\int_0^t g(X_n'(s))\,dX_n'(s) \to \int_0^t g(X_s')\,dX_s'$$

in L^2. Combining this with (6.6) and (6.7), we obtain

$$\int_0^t g(X_s')\,dX_s' = \int_0^t g(X_s')\,dW_s'.$$

Finally we let $\delta \to 0$ and obtain (6.5). □

7 Some estimates

Let

$$j^\varepsilon(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & |X_s^\varepsilon| \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \text{ or } |Y_s^\varepsilon| \in [-2\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon] \text{ or both;}\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let

$$J_t^\varepsilon = \int_0^t j_s^\varepsilon \, ds.$$

Set

$$Z_t^\varepsilon = X_t^\varepsilon - Y_t^\varepsilon,$$

suppose $Z_0^\varepsilon = 0$, and define $\psi_\varepsilon(x, y) = \varphi_\varepsilon(x) - \varphi_{2\varepsilon}(y)$. Then

$$dZ_t^\varepsilon = \psi_\varepsilon(X_t^\varepsilon, Y_t^\varepsilon) \, dW_t^\varepsilon.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \inf\{t : |Z_t^\varepsilon| \geq 6\varepsilon\}, \\ T_i &= \inf\{t \geq S_i : |Z_t^\varepsilon| \notin [4\varepsilon, b]\}, \\ S_{i+1} &= \inf\{t \geq T_i : |Z_t^\varepsilon| \geq 6\varepsilon\}, \qquad \text{and} \\ U_b &= \inf\{t : |Z_t^\varepsilon| = b\}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

Proposition 7.1. *For each n,*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n < U_b) \leq \Big(1 - \frac{2\varepsilon}{b}\Big)^n.$$

Proof. Since X^ε is a recurrent diffusion, $\int_0^t 1_{[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]}(X_s^\varepsilon) \, ds$ tends to infinity a.s. as $t \to \infty$. When $x \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$, then $|\psi_\varepsilon(x, y)| \geq c\varepsilon$, and we conclude that $\langle Z^\varepsilon \rangle_t \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$.

$Z_{t+S_n}^\varepsilon - Z_{S_n}^\varepsilon$ is a martingale started at 0 with respect to the regular conditional probability for the law of $(X_{t+S_n}^\varepsilon, Y_{t+S_n}^\varepsilon)$ given $\mathcal{F}_{S_n}$. The conditional probability that it hits 4ε before b if $Z_{S_n}^\varepsilon = 6\varepsilon$ is the same as the conditional probability it hits -4ε before $-b$ if $Z_{S_n}^\varepsilon = -6\varepsilon$ and is equal to

$$\frac{b - 6\varepsilon}{b - 4\varepsilon} \leq 1 - \frac{2\varepsilon}{b}.$$

Since this is independent of ω, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(|Z_{t+S_n}^\varepsilon - Z_{S_n}^\varepsilon| \text{ hits } 4\varepsilon \text{ before hitting } b \mid \mathcal{F}_{S_n}\Big) \leq 1 - \frac{2\varepsilon}{b}.$$

Let $V_n = \inf\{t > S_n : |Z^\varepsilon_t| = b\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} < U_b) &\le \mathbb{P}(S_n < U_b, T_{n+1} < V_n)\\ &= \mathbb{E}\,[\mathbb{P}(T_{n+1} < V_n \mid \mathcal{F}_{S_n}); S_n < U_b]\\ &\le \Big(1 - \frac{2\varepsilon}{b}\Big)\mathbb{P}(S_n < U_b).\end{aligned}$$

Our result follows by induction. □

Proposition 7.2. *There exists a constant* c_1 *such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\, J^\varepsilon_{T_n} \le c_1 n\varepsilon$$

for each n*.*

Proof. For t between times S_n and T_n we know that $|Z^\varepsilon_t|$ lies between 4ε and b. Then at least one of $X^\varepsilon_t \notin [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ and $Y^\varepsilon_t \notin [-2\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$ holds. If exactly one holds, then $|\psi_\varepsilon(X^\varepsilon_t, Y^\varepsilon_t)| \ge 1 - \sqrt{2\varepsilon/\gamma} \ge 1/2$ if ε is small enough. If both hold, we can only say that $d\langle Z^\varepsilon\rangle_t \ge 0$. In any case,

$$d\langle Z^\varepsilon\rangle_t \ge \tfrac{1}{4}\, dJ^\varepsilon_t$$

for $S_n \le t \le T_n$.

Z^ε_t is a martingale, and by Lemma 2.1 and an argument using regular conditional probabilities similar to those we have done earlier,

$$\mathbb{E}\,[J^\varepsilon_{T_n} - J^\varepsilon_{S_n}] \le 4\mathbb{E}\,[\langle Z^\varepsilon\rangle_{T_n} - \langle Z^\varepsilon\rangle_{S_n}] \le 4(b - 6\varepsilon)(2\varepsilon) = c\varepsilon. \tag{7.2}$$

Between times T_n and S_{n+1} it is possible that $\psi_\varepsilon(X^\varepsilon_t, Y^\varepsilon_t)$ can be 0 or it can be larger than $c\sqrt{\varepsilon/\gamma}$. However if either $X^\varepsilon_t \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ or $Y^\varepsilon_t \in [-2\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon]$, then $\psi_\varepsilon(X^\varepsilon_t, Y^\varepsilon_t) \ge c\sqrt{\varepsilon/\gamma}$. Thus

$$d\langle Z^\varepsilon\rangle_t \ge c\varepsilon\, dJ^\varepsilon_t$$

for $T_n \le t \le S_{n+1}$. By Lemma 2.1

$$\mathbb{E}\,[J^\varepsilon_{S_{n+1}} - J^\varepsilon_{T_n}] \le c\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbb{E}\,[\langle Z^\varepsilon\rangle_{S_{n+1}} - \langle Z^\varepsilon\rangle_{T_n}] \le c\varepsilon^{-1}(2\varepsilon)(10\varepsilon) = c\varepsilon. \tag{7.3}$$

Summing each of (7.2) and (7.3) over j from 1 to n and combining yields the proposition. □

Proposition 7.3. *Let $K > 0$ and $\eta > 0$. There exists R depending on K and η such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(J^\varepsilon_{\tau_{[-R,R]}(X^\varepsilon)} < K) \le \eta, \qquad \varepsilon \le 1/2.$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon \le 1/2$. We will see that our estimates are independent of ε. Note

$$J^\varepsilon_t \ge H_t = \int_0^t 1_{[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]}(X^\varepsilon_s)\, ds.$$

Therefore to prove the proposition it is enough to prove that

$$\mathbb{P}^0_\varepsilon(H_{\tau_{[-R,R]}(X^\varepsilon)} < K) \le \eta$$

if R is large enough.

Let $I = [-1, 1]$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\,0}_{\varepsilon} H_{\tau_I(X^\varepsilon)} \ge \int_{-1}^1 g_I(0,y)\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon} 1_{[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]}(y)\, dy \ge c_1.$$

On the other hand, for any $x \in I$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\,x}_{0} H_{\tau_I(X^\varepsilon)} = \int_I g_I(x,y)\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon} 1_{[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]}(y)\, dy \le c_2.$$

Combining this with

$$\mathbb{E}^{\,0}_{\varepsilon}[H_{\tau_I(X^\varepsilon)} - H_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \le \mathbb{E}^{\,X^\varepsilon_t}_{\varepsilon} H_{\tau_I(X^\varepsilon)}$$

and Theorem I.6.10 of [2] (with $B = c_2$ there), we see that

$$\mathbb{E}\, H^2_{\tau_I(X^\varepsilon)} \le c_3.$$

Let $\alpha_0 = 0$, $\beta_i = \inf\{t > \alpha_i : |X^\varepsilon_t| = 1\}$ and $\alpha_{i+1} = \inf\{t > \beta_i : X^\varepsilon_t = 0\}$. Since X^ε_t is a recurrent diffusion, each α_i is finite a.s. and $\beta_i \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$. Let $V_i = H_{\beta_i} - H_{\alpha_i}$. By the strong Markov property, under $\mathbb{P}^0_\varepsilon$ the V_i are i.i.d. random variables with mean larger than c_1 and variance bounded by c_4, where c_1 and c_4 do not depend on ε as long as $\varepsilon < 1/2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}^0_\varepsilon\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k V_i \le c_1 k/2\Big) &\le \mathbb{P}^0_\varepsilon\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k (V_i - \mathbb{E}\, V_i) \ge c_1 k/2\Big)\\
&\le \frac{\mathrm{Var}\,(\sum_{i=1}^k V_i)}{(c_1 k/2)^2}\\
&\le 4c_4/c_1^2 k.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking k large enough, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}^0_\varepsilon\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k V_i \le K\Big) \le \eta/2.$$

Using the fact that X^ε_t is a martingale, starting at 1, the probability of hitting R before hitting 0 is $1/R$. Using the strong Markov property, the probability of $|X|$ having no more than k downcrossings of $[0,1]$ before exiting $[-R,R]$ is bounded by

$$1-\Big(1-\frac{1}{R}\Big)^k.$$

If we choose R large enough, this last quantity will be less than $\eta/2$. Thus, except for an event of probability at most η, X^ε_t will exit $[-1,1]$ and return to 0 at least k times before exiting $[-R,R]$ and the total amount of time spent in $[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]$ before exiting $[-R,R]$ will be at least K. $\square$

Proposition 7.4. *Let $\eta>0, R>0$, and $I=[-R,R]$. There exists t_0 depending on R and η such that*

$$\mathbb{P}^0_\varepsilon(\tau_I(X^\varepsilon)>t_0)\le \eta, \qquad \varepsilon\le 1/2.$$

Proof. If $\varepsilon\le 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\,0}_\varepsilon\tau_R(X^\varepsilon)=\int_I g_I(x,y)\,m_\varepsilon(dy).$$

A calculation shows this is bounded by cR^2+cR, where c does not depend on ε or R. Applying Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}^0_\varepsilon(\tau_I(X^\varepsilon)>t_0)\le \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\,0}_\varepsilon\tau_I(X^\varepsilon)}{t_0},$$

which is bounded by η if $t_0\ge c(R^2+R)/\eta$. $\square$

8 Pathwise uniqueness fails

We continue the notation of Section 7.

Theorem 8.1. *There exist three processes X, Y, and W and a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ such that W is a Brownian motion under $\mathbb{P}$, X and Y are continuous martingales under $\mathbb{P}$ with speed measure m starting at 0,* (5.2) *holds for X,* (5.2) *holds when X is replaced by Y, and $\mathbb{P}(X_t \neq Y_t$ for some $t > 0) > 0$.*

Proof. Let $(X^\varepsilon, Y^\varepsilon, Z^\varepsilon)$ be defined as in (6.1) and (6.2) and choose a sequence ε_n decreasing to 0 such that the triple converges weakly on $C[0,N]\times C[0,N]\times C[0,N]$ for each n. By Theorems 6.1 and 6.2, the weak limit, (X, Y, W) is such that X and Y are continuous martingales with speed measure m, W is a Brownian motion, and (5.2) holds for X and also when X is replaced by Y.

Let $b = 1$ and let S_n, T_n, and U_b be defined by (7.1). Let $A_1(\varepsilon, n)$ be the event where $T_n \le U_b$. By Proposition 7.1

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1(\varepsilon, n)) \le \mathbb{P}(S_n \le U_b) \le \Big(1 - \frac{2\varepsilon}{b}\Big)^n.$$

Choose $n = \beta/\varepsilon$, where β is large enough so that the right hand side is less than 1/5 for all ε sufficiently small.

By Proposition 7.2,

$$\mathbb{E}\, J^\varepsilon_{T_n} \le c_1 n\varepsilon = c_1\beta.$$

By Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(J^\varepsilon_{T_n} \ge 5c_1\beta) \le \mathbb{P}(J^\varepsilon_{T_n} \ge 5\mathbb{E}\, J^\varepsilon_{T_n}) \le 1/5.$$

Let $A_2(\varepsilon, n)$ be the event where $J^\varepsilon_{T_n} \ge 5c_1\beta$.

Take $K = 10c_1\beta$. By Proposition 7.3, there exists R such that

$$\mathbb{P}(J^\varepsilon_{\tau_{[-R,R]}(X^\varepsilon)} < K) \le 1/5.$$

Let $A_3(\varepsilon, R, K)$ be the event where $J^\varepsilon_{\tau_{[R,R]}(X^\varepsilon)} < K$.

Choose t_0 using Proposition 7.4, so that except for an event of probability 1/5 we have $\tau_{[-R,R]}(X^\varepsilon) \le t_0$. Let $A_4(\varepsilon, R, t_0)$ be the event where $\tau_{[-R,R]}(X^\varepsilon) \le t_0$.

Let

$$B(\varepsilon) = (A_1(\varepsilon, n) \cup A_2(\varepsilon, n) \cup A_3(\varepsilon, R, K) \cup A_4(\varepsilon, R, t_0))^c.$$

Note $\mathbb{P}(B(\varepsilon)) \geq 1/5$.

Suppose we are on the event $B(\varepsilon)$. We have

$$J^{\varepsilon}_{T_n} \leq 5c_1\beta < K \leq J^{\varepsilon}_{\tau_{[-R,R]}(X^{\varepsilon})}.$$

We conclude that $T_n < \tau_{[-R,R]}(X^{\varepsilon})$. Therefore, on the event $B(\varepsilon)$, we see that T_n has occurred before time t_0. We also know that U_b has occurred before time t_0. Hence, on $B(\varepsilon)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_{s \leq t_0} |Z^{\varepsilon}_s| \geq b) \geq 1/5.$$

Since $Z^{\varepsilon} = X^{\varepsilon} - Y^{\varepsilon}$ converges weakly to $X - Y$, then with probability at least $1/5$, we have that $\sup_{s \leq t_0} |Z_s| \geq b/2$. This implies that $X_t \neq Y_t$ for some t, or pathwise uniqueness does not hold. □

We also can conclude that strong existence does not hold.

Theorem 8.2. *Let W be a Brownian motion. There does not exist a continuous martingale X with speed measure m such that* (5.2) *holds and such that X is measurable with respect to the filtration of W.*

Proof. Let W be a Brownian motion and suppose there did exist such a process X. Then there is a measurable map $F : C[0, \infty) \to C[0, \infty)$ such that $X = F(W)$.

Suppose Y is any other continuous martingale with speed measure m satisfying (5.2). Then by Theorem 4.1, the law of Y equals the law of X, and by Theorem 5.2, the joint law of (Y, W) is equal to the joint law of (X, W). Therefore Y also satisfies $Y = F(W)$, and we get pathwise uniqueness since $X = F(W) = Y$. However, we know pathwise uniqueness does not hold. We conclude that no such X can exist, that is, strong existence does not hold. □

References

[1] R.F. Bass, Markov processes with Lipschitz semigroups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **267** (1981), 307–320.

[2] R.F. Bass, *Probabilistic Techniques in Analysis*, New York, Springer, 1995.

[3] R.F. Bass, *Diffusions and Elliptic Operators*, New York, Springer, 1997.

[4] R.F. Bass, *Stochastic Processes*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

[5] R.F. Bass, K. Burdzy, and Z.-Q. Chen, Pathwise uniqueness for a degenerate stochastic differential equation, *Ann. Probab.* **35** (2007) 2385–2418.

[6] K. Itô and H.P. McKean, Jr., *Diffusion Processes and their Sample Paths.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974.

[7] I. Karatzas and S.E. Shreve, *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus, 2nd ed.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[8] F.B. Knight, *Essentials of Brownian Motion and Diffusion.* American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1981.

[9] J.-F. Le Gall, Applications du temps local aux équations différentielles stochastiques unidimensionnelles. *Séminaire de Probabilités, XVII*, 15–31, Springer, Berlin, 1983.

[10] S. Nakao, On the pathwise uniqueness of solutions of one-dimensional stochastic differential equations. *Osaka J. Math.* **9** (1972) 513–518.

[11] D. Revuz and M. Yor, *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion, 3rd ed.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

Richard F. Bass
Department of Mathematics
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269-3009, USA
`r.bass@uconn.edu`